

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Simons (US 7,023,845). Claims 1, 9 and 14 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 9 and 14 distinguish the '845 patent by reciting exclusive association of particular processors with particular protocols in a multi-protocol, multi-processor routing device. The Office suggests that this feature is taught at column 16, lines 50-61, and asserts that the mid-plane line cards of the '845 patent are associated with individual protocols. However, the cited passage and other sections of the '845 patent teach that individual ports can be configured to run different protocols. This is not the same as having processors dedicated to individual protocols. Indeed, the figures, e.g., Fig. 1, of the '845 patent illustrate each individual line card, e.g. (16n), as having a single processor, e.g., (26n). It follows that the single processor must be capable of supporting all of the protocols for which the associated ports can be configured. In other words, one processor support multiple protocols. It should also be noted that Column 17, lines 18-46, teaches only configuration tables, not a forwarding table. The '845 patent therefore represents an example of the problem that is solved by the presently claimed invention.

Despite the distinction described above, claims 1, 9 and 14 have been amended to emphasize that the set of protocol-dedicated processors are disposed on a single card. An example of this configuration is illustrated by the set of processors (406, 408, 410, 412, 414) on routing core (404) in Fig. 4, and the illustration of each routing core (304) being an individual card in Fig. 3. If this architecture were implemented in the context of the '845 patent, line card (16a) would have multiple processors (26a), each dedicated to a different protocol.

Consequently, the subset of ports dedicated to a first protocol would not split processor cycles with the subset of ports dedicated to a second protocol. Claims 1, 9 and 14 therefore distinguish the '845 patent by reciting limitations such as "a set of routing processors disposed on a single card coupled to the at least one interface, including a first routing processor exclusively associated with a first routing protocol for determining a set of routes, and a second routing processor exclusively associated with a second routing protocol for determining a set of routes" from claim 1. Claims 2-8, 10-13, and 15-19 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-19 is therefore requested.

For the reasons stated above, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

1/4/2007
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 120-475
Dd: 2/1/2007